linked document and (2) an importance of the linking documents.

The method of claim 46, wherein the importance of the linking documents is based on a number of documents that link to the linking documents.

The method of claim 18, wherein the assigning a score includes:

associating one or more backlinks with each of the linked documents, each of the backlinks corresponding to one of the linking documents that links to the linked document, assigning a weight to each of the backlinks, and

determining a score for each of the linked documents based on a number of backlinks for the linked document and the weights assigned to the backlinks.

The method of claim 48, wherein the processing of the linked documents includes:

organizing the linked documents based on the determined scores.

50. The method of claim 48, wherein the assigning a weight includes:

assigning different weights to at least some of the backlinks associated with at least one of the linked documents.

The method of claim 18, wherein the assigning a score includes:

associating one or more backlinks with each of the linked documents, each of the backlinks corresponding to one of the linking documents that links to the linked document, assigning a weight to each of the backlinks, and





determining a score for each of the linked documents based on a sum of the weights assigned to the backlinks associated with the linked document.

The method of claim of, wherein the weights assigned to each of the backlinks are independent of text of the corresponding linking documents.

The method of claim 18, wherein the assigning a score includes: determining the score primarily based on linking information.

The method of claim 18, wherein the assigning a score includes: determining the score substantially independent of user-query content.

The method of claim 18, wherein the assigning a score includes:

iteratively determining the score for a linked document, the score being primarily based on document-linking information and substantially independent of user-query content.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 18, 25, 28, and 38-45 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as anticipated by Ishikawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,848,407); rejected claims 19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishikawa et al.; rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishikawa et al. in view of Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art; rejected claims 21, 22, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ishikawa et al. in view of Egger et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,832,494); and rejected claims 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Applicant's allegedly admitted prior art in view of Egger et al.



6 -